

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The rejections to claims 1-10 are moot as the claims have been canceled.

New claims 11-18 have been added, of which claim 11 is independent. No new matter has been added. The new claims are patentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120686 A1) and Britton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,896) for two independent reasons set forth below.

Kim and Britton do not disclose or suggest, and would not have made obvious, a server comprising “means for converting the display information described in the second language, stored in the list, which corresponds to the identification information transmitted from the client to the display information described in the first language” as recited in claim 11.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the examiner acknowledges that Kim does not explicitly teach a server with “means for converting the changed display information described in the second language format into the first language format.” What is lacking in Kim is also not disclosed or suggested in Britton. Although Britton discloses converting HTML pages to an XML format (column 3, lines 32-37), the conversion is performed at the client, not the server. Britton does not disclose or suggest a server comprising “means for converting the display information described in the second language, stored in the list, which corresponds to the identification information transmitted from the client to the display information described in the first language.” Neither Kim nor Britton provides a motivation that the conversion be performed at the server.

Moreover, Kim and Britton do not disclose or suggest, and would not have made obvious, “means for displaying ... identification information corresponding to the objects to be edited ... on a web screen” as recited in claim 11. Although Kim discloses that the “content-oriented documents represented in XML and transformations in XSL become available through a private network 110 to a service server 104 that hosts what is generally referred to as a www (world wide web) site” (Kim, page 4, paragraph 058), Kim does not disclose or suggest that the “identification information corresponding to the objects to be edited” are displayed on the web screen. Similarly, while Britton teaches that “[p]ortions of the Web page for which content

Applicant : Hiroshi Takizawa et al.
Serial No. : 10/622,029
Filed : July 17, 2003
Page : 5 of 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 13357-003002 / 6YS-02S1048
CIP

tailoring is to be performed are converted from HTML format to XML format" (Britton, column 6, lines 17-19), Britton does not disclose or suggest that the "identification information corresponding to the objects to be edited" are displayed on the web screen.


Claims 12-18 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

Any circumstance in which the applicants have addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicants concede other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicants have made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicants have amended a claim does not mean that the applicants concede any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 13357-003002.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2005



Kevin Su
Reg. No. 57,377

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906